DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 871 EA 012 516

AUTHOR Hess, Fritz: And Others
TITLE Educational Vouchers: Current Perspectives.
INSTITUTION East Syracuse - Minoa Central Schools, East Syracuse, N.Y.
PUB DATE 29 Feb 80
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational History: *Education Vouchers: *Models: Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Coons (John)

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an overview of the educational voucher system, starting with definitions and continuing with an historical overview up to the present day. Arguments against the use of vouchers are also examined. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED182871

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EDUCATIONAL VOUCHERS: CURRENT PERSPECTIVES

FEBRUARY 29, 1980

EAST SYRACUSE-MINOA CENTRAL SCHOOLS
EAST SYRACUSE, NEW YORK

Fritz Hess
Wilfred Martin
Jerry Beck
Donald Parker
Ronald Lagoe

EA 012 516

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Hess

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDUCATIONAL VOUCHERS: CURRENT PERSPECTIVES

The voucher system of financing American education has been in and out of the national spotlight on numerous occasions during recent years, and most likely will continue to be of varying concern to the educational community. Recently, efforts to implement a voucher plan in California have focused attention on the concepts and the mechanics of this approach to educational finance. The arguments surrounding the California controversy have heightened public awareness of educational vouchers. Yet journalism and partisan arguments can only summarize the present situation. A more thorough understanding of vouchers arises from consideration of their development.

Educational Vouchers Defined

Vouchers have been defined in various ways. A popular explanation characterizes them as,

> "...certificates that the government would issue, to parents, parents would give to the school of their choice, and the school would return to the government for cash."[1]

More succinctly, they have been seen as "payment for education".[2] In a political sense, they have been termed mechanisms which stimulate freedom of educational choice.[3] They have also been called pathways for "private pursuit of the public purse".[4]

Each of these definitions is a valid description of an aspect of educational vouchers. Each summarizes a particular aspect of their nature. The definitions which connect vouchers with money emphasize that they represent reimbursement for schooling. The political definition highlights their flexibility of application. The focus on individuals calls attention to the pluralism which they supposedly guarantee.

Whatever the precise definition employed, certain aspects of vouchers persist. They are symbols of support for education, distributed by government to individuals within a society. Ideally, these symbols may be exchanged for schooling at any of a number of institutions. The government, or other civil authority, reimburses each school for the number of vouchers it obtains.

The essence and chief selling point of the voucher system is supposedly pluralism in education. It is free choice in instruction at its highest, and at its most extreme. Where universal public education focuses on academic freedom within a single organizational framework, the voucher system aims at diversity of education through multiplicity of institutions.

Inherent within the voucher system is the assumption that only pluralism will guarantee diversity of thought and educational excellence. The notion that no system of public education can promote diversity of thought is crucial. It implies that structural and financial characteristics determine directions, and that only diversity of organization will insure diversity of thought.

The idea that excellence emerges from competition is also important. Voucher plans emerge from the contention that public control inevitably stimulates mediocrity, and that the marketplace of ideas should extend to school organization, as well as to thought.

These and other insights emerge from an examination of the history of voucher education. In this context, the voucher approaches of today appear to be the latest of a long progression of similar ideas.

The Historical Context

Both public and private education are ancient institutions. Government schools were operated by classical Rome. Private education has been supported by church and other groups throughout the centuries. Yet the voucher concept did not arise until the eighteenth century.

It was Adam Smith who first proposed that governments limit educational spending to capital funding and give parents money to hire teachers. A believer in the liberty of thought and action which marked the enlightenment, Smith felt that the private sector, and not government, was the best guarantor of free choice.[5] Smith's sentiments were echoed by another Enlightenment thinker, Thomas Paine. Focusing on a particular aspect of the social structure, Paine suggested a plan of tax rebates which the poor could use to finance their children's education.[6]

The recommendations of Smith and Paine were characteristic of the social experimentation which marked the Enlightenment period. That period, at the close of the eighteenth century, was rooted in the belief that the human race was basically rational, and that simple reason could be applied to a wide range of problems. In addition to those first voucher concepts, the Enlightenment also produced the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man.

During the nineteenth century, a formal voucher system was not implemented in the United States. This pattern was probably due to the fact that American education was itself heterogeneous. At a time when almost every religious and social institution maintained its own school, public education served only a limited portion of the market, and there seemed little need for government stimulation of education pluralism.

At the same time, however, voucher ideas gained currency in Europe. In 1859, the British philosopher John Stuart Mill, suggested that government require a minimum education for each child, but allow parents to obtain this instruction as they pleased. Mill cautioned against implementing compulsory, state controlled schools, recommending that government education should be only one of a number of competing possibilities. Like Thomas Paine, Mill supported the concept of special subsidies for the education of the poor.[8]

Elsewhere on the Continent, the first wholesale implementation of a formal voucher system took place in Denmark. The Danish system centered on the so-called Free Schools, institutions founded by organizations, individuals, or groups of parents. Government inspection insured that these institutions met instructional and other standards. Each school, however, was left free to pursue its distinctive educational goals.

The Danish schools were not totally financed through public outlays, however. At least 85% of staff members' salaries, 50% of what it would cost to keep students in public school were reimbursed. The government also offered low interest loans for establishment and repair of Free School buildings.[9]

Only with the coming of the twentieth century did interest in voucher approaches begin to grow on this side of the Atlantic. The initial motivating force may have been the emergence of public schools as a dominating force in elementary and secondary education. As the western frontier vanished during the 1890's, so did the private educational frontier in many areas. The rise of public schools may have caused uneasiness in some quarters, and provoked a certain degree of interest in voucher systems.

The most visible manifestations of this interest were the so-called "nonoperating school districts of Vermont and New Hampshire". These entities were not school districts in the modern sense, since they did not own property and operate formal schools. Instead, they served as mechanisms for the support of education, paying local students' tuition at whatever neighboring public or private institution the family chose.[10]

Although implemented on a limited basis, the nonoperating district approach to the voucher system has shown considerable promise. Students have enrolled in a wide variety of institutions. All of those involved have seemed pleased with the results. The principal drawback of the approach has seemed to be its limited application. Nonoperating districts have depended on the existence of public, as well as private schools in other areas. Without someone else supplying the capital and other funding for the establishment of public schools, the free choice made possible through the concept is considerably reduced.[11]

While nonoperating districts were implemented in certain areas of the United States early in the 1900's, serious discussion of the voucher concept on a national basis did not develop until after mid-century. Beginning in the 1950's, renewed interest in voucher plans emerged in the educational community and society in general. This interest gave birth to a number of approaches and movements.

One of the most comprehensive voucher plans came from Milton Friedman, the celebrated University of Chicago economist. Friedman suggested that all parents of school age children be given flat grants to be used for education, in order to insure a minimum level of uniformity in education. Friedman recommended that the government inspect and 'approve' schools for participation within the voucher system. All approved institutions could participate in the plan.[12]

Friedman's approach, like the nonoperating districts which originated earlier in the century, sprang from fear of excessive government involvement in education. A conservative economist, Friedman believed that government dominated education was incompatible with a free enterprise system. He felt that efficiency and productivity in schools were best guaranteed by unlimited competition.[13]

The ideas of Friedman found favor in some sectors of American society. With the advent of the Nixon administration, in 1969, the White House began to demonstrate interest in the voucher approach. Late in 1969, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) commissioned Christopher Jencks and his associates to conduct a comprehensive study of the voucher system and its potential impact on compulsory education.[14]

Jencks and his colleagues had long been concerned with the financing of American schools. From firsthand experience, they had concluded that the existing system was failing to educate underclass students, especially those who came from inner city slums and ghettos. They had been impressed by the apparent successes of a number of small, highly innovative private schools in various areas of the nation. Jencks and his associates had observed that a system of vouchers or government subsidies would permit additional development of these institutions.[15]

The Harvard scholars applied these and other notions to an examination of the voucher system. Their product, entitled Educational Vouchers: A Report on Financing Elementary Education by Grants to Parents, surveyed the range of difficulties related to the system, and suggested possible implementation models.

An extensive discussion of the OEO study, usually referred to as the Jencks Report, is not attempted here. A few points contained in the study do, however, deserve emphasis.

It was conceded by the authors, that the environment of contemporary education would make the implementation of a voucher plan difficult at best. Particular items cited included disagreement over the goals and purposes of education, and problems in assessing the impact of various approaches. Uniform comparisons among various types of institutions were seen as next to impossible.

A related concern was the ability of educational consumers to choose the better curricula. It was noted that, especially among low income groups, demagogic techniques, rather than demonstrated performance might succeed in attracting large numbers of students.

Another important concern was the perpetuation of racial and ethnic segregation. Jencks and his associates noted that, by endorsing private education, the system would perpetuate and expand the present system of private and parochial schools. The diversity and flexibility inherent in this pattern would open the way for special treatment and/or exclusion of various groups.

The models proposed by the Cambridge educators spanned the full range of voucher possibilities. Their arguments centered on implementation of a full cost approach. This method would have covered the total operating cost of education.

Vouchers would have been given directly to parents. Having received information about participating institutions, families would presumably make effective choices. Opportunities for disadvantaged children would be enhanced by placing greater value on their vouchers. Institutions would thus be given incentives to admit those with fewer basic opportunities. Discrimination would be controlled through active surveillance and a lottery-related admissions system.

The system proposed by the Jencks group would have carried with it an immediate 10-15% increase in annual national expenditures for elementary and secondary education. In 1970 dollars, this increase would have totaled $5 billion annually.[16]

The OEO system was probably the first comprehensive approach to design and implementation of a voucher plan. It embodied the full funding and universality of the Friedman system, while making special provision for some of the difficulties inherent to these arrangements. It addressed racial and general discrimination in education. It emphasized that a general solution to these and other problems would be the most effective one.

Since the release of the Jencks Report, in 1970, other voucher models have been proposed. The so-called Sizer-Whitten Model has been offered as a specific approach to the schooling of the economically disadvantaged. Under this plan, each family whose income fell below the national average would be given a voucher for each child of school age. The value of these vouchers would vary according to income levels. Public and private schools would function as they do now, and would admit poor children via their vouchers.

The Sizer-Whitten model was not a comprehensive voucher plan in the strictest sense. It focused on support of education among low income groups, to the exclusion of other segments of the society. A product of the 1960's, the plan reflected the concern with educational opportunities for the urban poor which marked that decade.

During the 1970's, other voucher models emerged. As the decade progressed, interest in these approaches seemed to be rising.

The Family Power Equalizing model was developed in California in 1971. The plan incorporated varying approaches to education and differing tuition levels. Each family would select a school on the basis of educational philosophy and tuition. The State would then assess each family according to its own income level, and the tuition of the institution it selected.

As its name suggests, the Family Power Equalizing model would allow households of differing incomes to obtain similar levels of schooling for their children. Under this approach, wealthy families would pay all or almost all of the cost of the children's education. Middle and lower income groups would pay up to predetermined ceilings, with the State reimbursing the difference. The cost of this reimbursement would be derived from general tax revenue. All property taxes would be abolished.

The Family Power Equalizing Model would effectively centralize financial control of education within state government. To solidify this control, the approach also called for abolition of local school district authority. Under the model, the state would acquire each district's property and financial obligations. The "job rights of present employees of abolished districts", were to be given "substantial protection".

As the Friedman, Jencks, and Sizer-Whitten models reflected their respective political and economic environments, the Family Power Equalizing approach mirrored the interest in wholesale reform of educational finance which characterized the early 1970's. In the wake of the Serrano and other court decisions, which challenged existing means of educational support, the Family Power Equalizing Model emerged as a contrast to existing methods of school support. Where the status quo often depended on the wealth of individual families, the Family approach emphasized comprehensive state support. Where the existing system focused on decentralized, local control, the Family model swept away the local framework in favor of central authority. Where the traditional system relied heavily on the property tax, the new framework leaned on general tax revenue.

With the Family Power Equalizing Model, probably the most famous voucher plan to emerge from the 1970's was the so-called Coons-Sugarman approach. Like the Family model, the Coons approach was born out of concern for the lack of choice and structural inequities in American public education. John Coons had analyzed these patterns in Illinois and other areas of the Nation during the 1960's. Armed with a Russell Sage Foundation grant, Coons and two associates, Steven Sugarman and William W. Clune, began an analysis of school finance and educational policy reform late in the decade. The product of these efforts, Private Wealth and Public Education, became a keystone of voucher system philosophy during the 1970's.[18]

As a legal document, Private Wealth and Public Education was directed at the full range of political and economic concerns associated with educational finance. Its philosophical thesis, that wealth discrimination among public schools could be eliminated while enhancing local control, was related to that of the Family Power Equalizing concept. It focused narrowly on educational opportunity and family choice as the basis of educational philosophy and organization.

After the publication of Private Wealth and Public Education, in 1970, the Coons variant of the voucher model underwent a number of modifications. What emerged was a modified voucher plan. This approach addressed free choice throughout elementary and secondary schools without entailing the wholesale reorganization required by the Family Power Equalizing model.

The Coons voucher "initiative", would group schools into three classes: public schools, public scholarship schools, and private scholarship schools. Public schools would continue to exist. Public scholarship schools would be private, not-for-profit corporations. Private scholarship schools would be institutions run for profit.[19]

Under Coons' approach, vouchers would be issued to all parents. Families would then choose their childrens' schools. If they chose the public schools, their vouchers would not be used, since these institutions are already funded through local and state sources. If they chose public or private scholarship schools, they would exchange their vouchers for education at these institutions. The State government would reimburse each scholarship school for the vouchers it received.[20]

In its initial form, the Coons approach included subsidies for not-for-profit and profit-oriented institutions, while sanctioning the continued existence of public education. A phased implementation scheme promised to increase levels of competition for public schools, however. If his voucher plan were approved in a 1980 California referendum, Coons planned that, by 1984, one half of the State's elementary and secondary students would be eligible to receive scholarships. The following year, it was projected that three-fourths of the students would be eligible.

The Coons model included a number of specific financial provisions. The average cost per scholarship was fixed at ninety per cent "Of the average public cost in the same year of similar public students enrolled in the public schools."[21] To prevent the development of excessive costs, a temporary tax cap was also included. Coons provided that the total public cost of elementary and secondary education (public schools plus scholarship schools) in the years after implementation should not exceed the cost of public education and subsidized to private schools before implementation. The expenditure cap was to last for only a limited time, to permit implementation of the voucher plan on a phased basis without constraining future reforms.[22]

Like other voucher models, the Coons approach would facilitate choice among educational institutions. The sanctioning of public and private scholarship schools would supposedly stimulate the growth of private alternatives to public education. The existence of vouchers or scholarships, would enable middle income and poor families to opt for these alternatives without undergoing undue financial hardship.[23]

Specific terms of Coons model expressly included parochial schools. It was noted that no school should be ineligible to redeem scholarships because it taught "moral values, philosophy, or religion".

Additionally, certain minimum requirements were to be placed on participating institutions. Certification by the state superintendent was required of all public and private scholarship schools. To obtain certification, applicants would be required to meet certain minimum curriculum standards; disclose teacher qualifications and pupil performance on standardized tests; and not exercise discrimination in hiring. Employees of scholarship schools were also guaranteed the right to organize and bargain collectively with employers.[24]

Benefiting from the philosophical development of other approaches, and encounters with the realities of contemporary society, the Coons model was certainly the most structured and possibly the most realistic voucher plan. It included a phased implementation plan and provisions for the extension of such essentials as guarantees against job discrimination to participating institutions. It recognized that, the first requirement should be to stimulate competition for public schools. In this context, the Coons approach focused on development of alternatives to existing public schools rather than decreeing away these institutions in a single fiat.

Considerable speculation has arisen concerning the possible impact of the Coons approach. Most concede that it would foster the development of free choice. Most authorities also conclude that it would do so through promoting the development of a state-centered system of private education.

The real issue may center on the nature of the diversity promoted by the model. Ostensively, a range of profit and not-for-profit institutions would arise to challenge public education. The effect of state standards and state financing on this diversity would be demonstrated only through implementation of the approach.

The plans of Friedman, Jencks, Coons, and others summarize the range of contemporary approaches to voucher education. Each of them includes important aspects of what might be termed "voucher philosophy".

Yet each of these plans has its critics. The rise of interest in voucher education has been paralleled by widespread questioning of the advisability and practicality of such systems. Central to any consideration of educational vouchers is a description of the current debate concerning their application.[25]

The Present Context: The Debate over Vouchers

It should come as no surprise that educational vouchers have deep rooted support and strong opposition. Based on some of the most fundamental tenets of American political life, yet challenging many traditional institutions, their impact has been both comforting and disquieting. The practicality of vouchers also remains to be evaluated.

Supporters of voucher plans appeal both to the most ancient roots of American culture and to the most immediate manifestations of the national experience. As was noted above, voucher systems apply freedom of choice to education in the same way it is applied to most forms of consumer purchasing. Proponents argue that, if instruction is as essential to life as eating or the development of households, free choice should also apply to education. They assume that no single institution, however comprehensive in orientation, can guarantee this choice. Many voucher supporters also argue that public education "peddles" its own brand of liberal humanism.

In addressing the present condition of American education, voucher advocates see additional necessity for their cause. Coons and others have claimed that monolithic public education has fostered lack of accountability; stagnation, and sterility.[26] They see "public" education as out of public control. They claim that lack of reasonable alternatives has caused public schools to become ineffective.[27]

Underlying the voucher movements is a general distrust in the ability of government to guarantee quality and excellence in education. A reaction against the standardization of instruction has been paralleled by a feeling that private enterprise can best promote efficiency and excellence in instruction and other fields. Milton Friedman contends that the free market, rather than public institutions are the best guarantors of quality since it rests on competition, rather than benign intention.[28] Proponents of educational vouchers thus argue that their approach is rooted in human reality, rather than abstract planning.

Against these positions, critics of voucher education call up a number of noteworthy arguments. In a general sense, they claim that a free market, in education as in other areas, is a fantasy. They note that even general voucher approaches provide for some form of government regulation. They note that even the non-operating school districts of New England depend on the existence of public education elsewhere. They emphasize that public schools developed in response to demographic and financial needs which could not be answered by the private sector.[29] Their arguments highlight the fact that, while private education was sufficient for the needs of the nineteenth century, most private elementary and secondary schools cannot provide sufficient resources for contemporary education.

In this context, Stephen Arons and other voucher critics argue that this approach to education is inefficient and unworkable. As an example, they cite the logistics of transporting large numbers of students as a problem which could not be dealt with in the private sector.

Opponents of the voucher system also claim that, even if implemented, it would not accomplish its goals. They concede that, while it might stimulate excellence in some sectors, it will also generate and maintain diversity in the quality of schooling. This diversity, they emphasize, would span the worst, as well as the best aspects of education.[31]

In a similar vein, critics have also argued that voucher systems will foster polarization in education. They claim that wholesale proliferation of institutions will bring with it discrimination. They call attention to the difficulties presently encountered in affirmative action in education, and note that these difficulties will multiply as the number of private institutions grow. In this context, they point out that the growth of diversity will bring a growth of inequity.[32]

Critics also point out that voucher systems will lead to centralization of government control over schools. By undermining local districts and placing educational revenues in State hands, they claim that the approach will ruin traditional, local schools. Ironically, they note, a system designed to foster pluralism will foster centralization.

Another important aspect of the case against voucher education concerns the public schools. Freeman Butts and others have pointed out that voucher plans expect too much from public education. They emphasize that public schools have historically been pathways to equality for many social groups, adding that the infusion of these groups has placed overwhelming demands on these institutions. Private schools, they conclude, have often been selective in accepting students, and have not dealt with these realities.[33]

Voucher critics also claim that, despite these conditions, Jencks and his colleagues prefer a variety of elitist, selective institutions to a single framework of public education for all. They point out that, under these conditions, voucher education becomes a retreat from the social challenges which have shaped American life. They see the approach as something akin to the extreme particularism which marked medieval times.

At the most basic level, the argument against vouchers focuses on practicality. In this sense, the case is probably most compelling. The fact is that voucher education is yet to be implemented, much less evaluated, on a general basis. Until it is, there can be no support for its effectiveness. The consequences of implementing it on such a basis, they point out, would disrupt, perhaps forever, the democratic foundation of American education.

Arguments such as these summarize the diversity of opinion concerning the voucher controversy. Both sides cite traditions and values to support their cases. In the absence of implementation of an actual plan, however, projections of the impact of vouchers must remain speculation.

Educational Vouchers: The View from 1980

Because evaluation of voucher education must await the implementation of such a system, efforts to deal with the voucher philosophy must focus on existing organizational frameworks. The recent failure of John Coons' petition drive in California indicates that a working voucher model is at least a few years away. Yet the implications of such a model confront every school district in the nation. These implications are important lessons of the 1960's and 70's which must not be lost as the new decade begins.

The long discussion of voucher plans contained in this presentation traces the origins of a number of these phenomena. The proposals span a considerable range, from the abstract and idealistic, to the concrete and earthy.

There can be little doubt that a large measure of the present support for voucher plans is both traditional and idealistic. Concern for freedom and individual rights, whatever the form, is anything but dead in America. The past decade has also witnessed the development of distrust in all forms of government. Naturally much of this distrust has taken the form of support for non-public programming, such as voucher education.

Still, ideology alone cannot explain the current popularity of voucher systems. The Nation has always been ethically oriented. Yet interest in voucher plans has markedly increased only during the past twelve years. Americans of the early twentieth century went to war for democracy and free choice, while nonoperating school districts achieved popularity in very limited areas.

Only the recent discontent with public education has reached a magnitude sufficient to provoke challenges to the whole system. Progressively lower scores on standardized examinations and alarming dips in national productivity have caused the public to wonder what is happening to public education. Against the background of a school system which made possible great military and industrial feats, and which stretched the country's reach to the edges of the solar system, the present situation has caused consternation.

In response to this challenge, public education has unfortunately assumed a defensive posture. The peripheral practicalities, rather than the central realities, of the current situation have been addressed. It is noted that voucher schools could not provide comprehensive transportation and extra-curricular resources. It is claimed that they would be inefficient, since a large number of institutions would be subsidized. The central concern of fundamental education in a democratic society remains unaddressed, however.

This situation is particularly unfortunate. During the past decades, public education has been the backbone of democracy and America. Through it, blacks, women, and other groups have approached and attained equality of opportunity. Long after the disappearance of the frontier and wholesale immigration, public education remains a keystone of opportunity for all.

In part because of this pattern, the performance of public schools has, declined in recent years. This decline in performance has given fuel to the attacks of many voucher advocates.

Obviously, this crucial issue cannot be ignored indefinitely. Public educators know how to produce results. The present system was more productive decades ago. The notions which contribute to that productivity remain. Greater challenges, such as guaranteeing opportunity for all Americans, cannot be an excuse for mediocrity. Production and performance may not be popular words in the current educational vocabulary. Yet unless they are revived, alternative education may become a focus of learning in the United States.

The answers to these current dilemmas bear no magic titles or jargonese phraseology. Performance contracting is an old practice. Accountability is a similar tradition. It is decried by those who don't know their function or who are not performing adequately. Those who excel invite it. If the challenges of the present are formidable, so are the resources and understanding which may be mobilized against them.[34]

Public educators must organize around their goals, rather than their comforts. The key lies in the shift of focus. Once the emphasis is placed on performance, and evaluation oriented toward this end, the system will challenge itself to progressively higher levels of excellence.[35]

It is clear that the current state of public education requires more work within existing institutions, rather than additional efforts in the creation of new ones. Yet unless the former course of action is pursued, the latter will result. Voucher movements have added perspective to this situation, but the stimulus to action need not be a negative one. The challenge of excellence is greater now than it has ever been. The fruits of achieving that excellence, for educators as well as for students, will be boundless.

Reference Notes

1. Joseph Lindelow, Educational Vouchers (Burlingame, California: Association of California School Administrators, 1979):1.

2. Judith Areen and Christopher Jencks, "Educational Vouchers: A Proposal for Diversity and Choice", Teachers College Record 72 (3) (February 1971): 327

3. Ibid., 327-28.

4. R. Freeman Butts, "Educational Vouchers: The Private Pursuit of the Public Purse", Phi Delta Kappan (September 1979): 7-11

5. Areen and Jencks, "Educational Vouchers: A Proposal for Diversity and Choice", 327.

6. E.G. West, "Tom Paine's Voucher Scheme for Public Education", Southern Economic Journal (1966-67): 378.

7. Lindelow, Educational Vouchers, 6-7.

8. Ibid., 7.

9. Ibid., 17-19.

10. Ibid., 17.

11. Ibid.

12. Milton Freidman, Capitalism and Freedom (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

13. Ibid.

14. Stephen Arons, "Equity, Opportunity, and Vouchers", Teachers College Record 72 (3) (February 1971): 337.

15. David Selden, "Vouchers - Solution or Sop?", Teachers College Record 72 (3) (February 1971): 366.

16. Christopher Jencks et al, "Educational Vouchers" (Cambridge, Mass: Center for the Study of Public Education, 1969).

17. Lindelow, Educational Vouchers, 34-35.

18. John E. Coons, William H. Clune III, and Stephen D. Sugarman, Private Wealth and Public Education (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1970).

19. Lindelow, Educational Vouchers, 34-38.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., 37.

22. "Vouchers: A Controversial Issue:, Education Tomorrow (October 1979): 1,3.

23. John E. Coons, "Of Family Choice and Public Education", Phi Delta Kappan (September 1979): 10-13.

24. Ibid., 13.

25. Butts, "Educational Vouchers: The Private Pursuit of the Public Purse", 7-11.

26. John E. Coons, "Can Education Be Equal and Excellent?", Journal of Education Finance 4 (Fall 1979):147-57.

27. Ibid.

28. Friedman, Capitalism and Freedom.

29. Arons, "Equity, Opportunity, and Vouchers", 338-61.

30. Ibid., 340-45.

31. Butts, "Educational Vouchers: The Private Pursuit of the Public Purse", 7-10.

32. Ibid, 10-11.

33. Ibid., 10-11, 71; Arons, "Equity, Opportunity, and Vouchers", 351-70.

34. Performance Contracting in Schools: Profit Motive Tested as Incentive to Learning (Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1972).

35. Ibid.: The School Executive's Guide to Performance Contracting (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1972).